

Remarks

As stated above, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and request reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

As of the office action of Aug. 3, 2009, claims 1-17, 20, and 23-30 were pending in the subject application, of which claims 1, 11, and 20 are independent claims. With this response applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 20, and 24.

A. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-17, 20, 23, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over David Embly, et al., ONTOLOGY-BASED EXTRACTION AND STRUCTURING OF INFORMATION FROM DATA-RICH UNSTRUCTURED DOCUMENTS, (Conf. of Information and Knowledge Mgmt., D.C., 1998) ("Embly") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0037032 ("Neece"). *Office Action* at p. 4. Applicants contend that Embly and Neece do not render the amended claims obvious because Embly and Neece, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest "generating . . . role templates required for a project from one or more unstructured text documents associated with the project" as claimed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method for generating one or more role templates required for a project from one or more unstructured text documents associated with the project, the method comprising:

extracting, via a search engine executed by a role generator system, key words from unstructured text in the one or more documents associated with the project, wherein the one or more documents are stored on a storage medium accessible across a network;

mapping, by the role generator system, the key words extracted from the unstructured text in the one or more documents to predefined job skill definitions in a skills taxonomy;

generating, by the role generator system, a list of skills based, at least in part, on the predefined job skill definitions mapped to the key words extracted from the unstructured text;

comparing, by the role generator system, the list of skills to one or more predefined role templates, the predefined role templates including a list of skills required to perform a predefined role;

when the generated list of skills at least partially matches the list of skills included in the predefined role template, generating, by the role generator system, a new role template for the project based, at least in part, on the predefined role template, wherein the new role template defines a role required for the project and includes at least a portion of the job skill definitions included in the predefined role template; and

when the generated list of skills does not match the list of skills included in the predefined role template, generating, by the role generator system, a new role template for the project based on the generated list of skills.

The other independent claims contain similar elements—Applicants believe the following analysis applies to all the independent claims (namely claims 1, 11, and 20).

Applicants respectfully assert that Embly does not disclose, suggest, or teach "generating . . . role templates required for a project from one or more unstructured text documents associated with the project" as claimed. Embly appears to disclose a system that takes unstructured text as input, compares the unstructured text to predefined keywords, extracts keywords from the unstructured text, and produces a structured text document. *Embly* at 1, 3-5. Embly appears to, essentially, re-organize unstructured information into a structured format suitable for entry into a database. *Id.* For example, Embly describes a system that reads in car advertisements that do not have a particular format, and produces the same or similar car advertisements re-organized into a standard format. *Embly* at 3-5. Embly's input is a car advertisement, and Embly's output is the same car advertisement in a different format. *Id.* Embly's system also reads in job advertisements that do not have a set format and produces the same job advertisements in a standard format. *Id.* at pp. 5-6. As with the car advertisement, the

job advertisement that Embly produces is the same job advertisement, just reformatted and re-organized.

Neece also does not teach or disclose "generating . . . role templates required for a project from one or more unstructured text documents associated with the project" as claimed. The Examiner, citing Neece's paragraph 34, suggests that Neece discloses "comparing a skills list with one or more predefined role templates[.]" *Office Action* at p. 6. Applicants respectfully disagree. Neece describes a system where, given a blank form or an existing position, a user can "search" to find a suitable or similar position. *Neece* at ¶ 34. Neece also discloses a web-based system that allows users to create positions (jobs) using, in some cases, predefined job templates or blank forms. *Id.* All the methods for defining a position described in Neece appear to be manual, or partially manual, requiring input from a user. *Id.* at ¶¶ 34-36. Neece does not, however, appear to disclose "comparing a skills list with one or more predefined role templates," as the Examiner suggests.

The skills list in the claims is "generated . . . based, at least in part, on . . . the key words extracted from the unstructured text." (See Claim 1). Neece does not appear to generate a skills list based on key words *extracted* from project documents, as claimed.

Even in combination, Embly and Neece do not appear to "generat[e] . . . role templates required for a project from one or more unstructured text documents associated with the project" as claimed. As discussed, Embly extracts and reorganizes information, but does not generate role templates from project documents having an unstructured format. Neece discloses predefined job templates that can be chosen or searched for by a user. But the combination of these references does not appear to suggest a system that effectuates a transformation from unstructured project documents to role templates for a project. Neither reference appears to discuss, suggest, or disclose generating or extracting role templates from project documents by

extracting key words from unstructured project documents, and using the *extracted* key words to generating a role template for the project based on the extracted key words from the project documents.

Amended claim 1 sets forth various elements that effectuate the generation of a role template from project documents: key words are extracted from unstructured text in documents associated with a project. The *extracted* key words are mapped to job skill definitions in a skills taxonomy. A list of skills is generated based, in part, upon the mapping. The list of skills is compared to predefined role templates. When the list of skills matches a predefined role template, a new role template for the project is generated based on the predefined role template. When the list of skills does not match a predefined role template, a new role template is generated based on the list of skills extracted from the project document.

Through this method, the claimed invention may generate role templates for a project based upon key words extracted from project documents. The invention may, essentially, transform key words extracted from documents associated with a project into role templates for the project. As discussed, Embly re-organizes extracted keywords, and Neece provides predefined position (job) templates. But Embly and Neece, alone or in combination, do not appear to transform key words extracted from project documents into role templates for a project.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants contend independent claims 1, 11, and 20 are patentable under § 103 over Embly and Neece. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 1, 11, and 20. Applicants also request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 2, 4-10, 12-13, 15-17, 23, and 25-30 because they are dependent upon claims 1, 11, and 20.

The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 14, and 24 under § 103 over Embly, Neece, and U.S. Patent No. 6,275,812 ("Haq"). *Office Action* at p. 13. As discussed, Applicants contend that claims 1, 11, and 20 are patentable under § 103 over Embly and Neece. Haq is generally directed toward using a skill template to facilitate employee training, development, and management. *Haq* at abstract. Haq does not, however, appear to disclose "generating . . . role templates required for a project from one or more unstructured text documents associated with the project" as claimed. Therefore, Applicants contend that claims 1, 11, and 20 are patentable under § 103 over Embly, Neece, and Haq. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 3, 14, and 24, because they are dependent upon claims 1, 11, and 20.

B. Conclusion

In consideration of the amendments and foregoing discussion, the application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Early allowance of the subject application is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' agent, Seth Milman, at 617-305-2136 to facilitate prosecution of the application.

This response should not require any additional fees. However, in the event that additional fees are due, please charge or credit any refund to our Deposit Account No. 50-2324.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 23 October 2009

/Seth A. Milman/
Seth A. Milman
Reg. No. 64,573

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116-3889
Telephone 617-305-2136
Facsimile 617-523-6850